This Reply is in response to the Final Office Action mailed November 29, 2007.

I.   Summary of Examiner's Rejections

Prior to the Office Action mailed November 29, 2007, Claims 1-16, 18-24, 26-35, 37 and 39 were pending in the Application. In the Office Actions, Claim 15 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112. Claims 1-3, 8, 9, 11-13, 18-19, 22, 24, 29, 32, 34, 37 and 39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable under Shen et al. (US 2004/0221322) (hereinafter "Shen") in view of Plow et al. (US 6,429,883) (hereinafter "Plow"). Claims 4-7, 10, 20-21, 23, 30, 31 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Shen, in view of Plow, and further in view of Takata et al. (EP 0990998) (hereinafter "Takata"). Claims 14-16, 26 and 35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Shen, in view of Plow, and further in view of Smith (US 5,933,141) (hereafter "Smith"). Claims 27 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Shen, in view of Plow, further in view of Takata, and further in view of Frank et al. (US 5,651,107) (hereinafter "Frank").

II.   Summary of Applicant's Amendments

The present Reply amends Claims 1, 3, 11-12, 18-22, 29-32; cancels Claims 4-7, 13-17, 23-28, 33-39; and adds Claims 40-55; all as shown above. Applicant respectfully reserves the right to prosecute any originally presented or cancelled claims in a continuing or future application.

III.   Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §112

In the Office Actions, Claim 15 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112. Claim 15 has been cancelled herein.

IV.   Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-3, 8, 9, 11-13, 18-19, 22, 24, 29, 32, 34, 37 and 39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable under Shen in view of Plow. Claims 4-7, 10, 20-21, 23, 30, 31 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Shen, in view of Plow, and further in view of Takata. Claims 14-16, 26 and 35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Shen, in view of Plow, and further in view of Smith. Claims 27 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Shen, in view of Plow, further in view

of <u>Takata</u>, and further in view of <u>Frank</u>.

Claim 1

Claim 1 has been amended by the currently Reply to more clearly define the embodiment therein. As amended, Claim 1 defines:

A system to support multimedia content browsing on mobile devices, comprising:
a multimedia content database;
a processing component which searches for and retrieves two or more multimedia contents from the multimedia content database, wherein the processing component transmits the two or more multimedia contents to a browsing component over a communication network;
said browsing component which renders the two or more multimedia contents on two or more content layers, wherein the two or more content layers always overlap each other in totality within a single display area, and wherein the display area for the content layers is not moved or stretched in the x-y plane by users' instruction; and
a transparent widget layer rendered on the display area of the browsing component, the transparent widget layer being completely transparent within the display area until activated by a user, the transparent widget layer used to independently, interactively and continuously adjust the degree of transparency of the two or more content layers via an input device, wherein transparency values for the two or more content layers comprise continuous gradient values between 0.0 and 1.0, a content layer having a transparency value of 0.0 being completely transparent and a content layer having a transparency value of 1.0 being completely opaque.

Applicant's invention embodied in Claim 1 is not disclosed in <u>Shen</u> for, among other things, the following reason. First, the transparency values for each display area in <u>Shen</u> cannot be adjusted to include continuous gradient values between 0 and 1, a content layer having a transparency value of 0 being completely transparent and a content layer having a transparency value of 1 being completely opaque. In <u>Shen</u>, the display areas are either completely transparent or completely opaque. Second, the display areas in <u>Shen</u> do not always overlap each other in totality within a single display area. In fact, they never will in <u>Shen</u>. Third, users interact with the display areas by moving or stretching the display area in the x-y plane in <u>Shen</u>. In the embodiment of the invention set forth in Claim 1, the users do not move or stretch the display area for the content layers in the x-y plane, thereby allowing the system to manage the size of the display area within the mobile device on its own. Finally, <u>Shen</u> does not disclose the use of a transparent widget layer to adjust the transparency values of the two or more content layers via an input device. <u>Shen</u>, therefore, does not disclose the embodiment of the invention set forth in Claim 1.

Applicant's invention embodied in Claim 1 is similarly not disclosed in <u>Plow</u>. <u>Plow</u> discloses a method for viewing hidden entities by varying window or graphic object transparencies. More

-13-

specifically, <u>Plow</u> appears to use the same "windows" style overlapping display system used in <u>Shen</u>. Accordingly, <u>Shen</u> and <u>Plow</u> both teach away from using a system that prevents users from moving or stretching the display area for the content layers in the x-y plane. Additionally, in <u>Plow</u>, if the windows are stacked to overlap each other in totality, the transparency value of the lower screen cannot be adjusted independently as set forth in Claim 1. Furthermore, the display windows in <u>Plow</u> so not always overlap each other in totality which is the case with Claim 1. Moreover, there would be absolutely no motivation to always overlap the transparent layers in <u>Plow</u> given the fact that it uses a "windows" style overlapping display system wherein the windows are intended to be resized by the user. In other words, <u>Plow</u> cannot be read to conclude that it would teach a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to effectively limit the functionality of its windows and always overlap the windows used therein because it is inherent to the invention in <u>Plow</u> that there will be enough room to utilize the "windows" style overlapping system. That is not the case with the invention embodied in Claim 1. Finally, <u>Plow</u> also fails to disclose the use of a transparent widget layer to adjust the transparency values of the two or more content layers via an input device. <u>Plow</u>, therefore, does not disclose the embodiment of the invention set forth in Claim 1 nor renders it obvious when viewed in light of <u>Shen</u>.

In view of the comments provided above, Applicant respectfully submits that the embodiment defined by Claim 1 is neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited reference, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 19, 29

Independent Claims 19 and 29 are not addressed separately but it is respectfully submitted that those claims are allowable for the same reasons that Claim 1 is allowable as commented on above. Again, the inventions embodied in Claims 19 and 29 involve an inventive concept that allows the invention to display a plurality of content layers within a small space while avoiding the traditional "windows" style overlapping display

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 19 and 29 are neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested

Claim 2-3, 8-9, 11-12, 18, 20-22, 30-32

Claims 2-3, 8-9, 11-12, 18, 20-22 and 30-32 are not addressed separately but it is respectfully submitted that those claims are allowable as depending from an allowable independent

-14-

claim and further in view of the comments provided above for Claim 1. Applicant respectfully submits that these Claims are similarly neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited reference, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. It is also submitted that these claims also add their own limitations which render them patentable in their own right. Applicant respectfully reserves the right to argue these limitations should it become necessary in the future.

Claims 40-55

Claims 40-55 are newly added claims. Overall, these claims, much like Claim 1, are not disclosed by the cited references because they depend upon independent claims which avoid using the "windows" style overlapping display system used in the cited references. By stacking the content layers to overlap each other in totality and preventing the user to manipulate the display area for the content layers, the invention is allowed to effectively manage and maximize the size of the display area on its own within mobile device. Accordingly, the previously cited references teach away from the inventions embodied in the Claims 40-55.

Applicant respectfully submits that the embodiments defined by Claims 40-55 are neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited reference, or any other references.

IV.   Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

-15-

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: __Feb. 7, 2008_____   By: __/Rex Hwang/_____
                                           Rex Hwang
                                           Reg. No. 56206

Customer No. 23910
FLIESLER MEYER LLP
650 California Street, 14th Floor
San Francisco, California 94108
Telephone: (415) 362-3800